

Re draft "Proposed Expansion of SRS T/O"

1. I believe it might be more appropriate to introduce the question of T/O as an "either / or" proposition : "Either we expand the T/O which now is way below Mr. Bissell's original proposal -- or we must limit ourselves to barest essentials, notably be available for consultation on intelligence aspects of International Communism, but cannot be expected to do much substantive research or paper-writing". I would consider such an "either/or" formulation as a useful test to find out how much real interest in SRS the DDI actually has and what he wants us to do. If we are not supposed to engage in research or to prepare substantive papers, why should we try to increase personnel ?

25X1A9a

2. The proposed T/O is actually smaller than [redacted]'s original proposal of 5 senior staff members plus 5 research assistants ( [redacted] hardly thought that we should do without clerical or secretarial help ). I wonder whether this is the best conceivable tactic. Couldn't our very restraint be interpreted that we don't really think very much of the scope of our work ?

25X1A9a 3. It might also be advisable to link the personnel question closely to the problem of utilizing personnel outside SRS for our purposes -- either elsewhere in DDI ( [redacted] staff ? ) or via external research. As long as there is no machinery whereby we can obtain such utilization, we obviously have to demand additional personnel.

4. I disagree with the last sentence in para 2. The job of the staff secretary, even with our present volume of work, will be well nigh full-time, considering our high literary standards, repeated differences of opinion in substance as well as in formulation. If he can do some substantive work on the side, that is fine, but I would not promise this in writing.

5. I therefore also disagree with para 3 - b, especially if "fields of special interest" is meant ~~that~~ to indicate that Chief, Deputy Chief and Staff Secretary will have geographic areas or functional divisions of International Communism, for which they will be responsible, as the former two are now.

6. If the junior research assistants "will be encouraged to develop fields of substantive interest" and either to prepare papers of their own ....", they will be obviously of little help to the Senior Staff members. I always understood that their function was ( or should be )

- a) do a preliminary screening of the daily intake
- b) do the library ~~or~~ file research incidental to any project assigned to a Staff Member
- c) prepare bibliographies and similar aids.

Para 4 c should be changed accordingly.

7. I repeat that I would consider ~~a~~ the position of a "Senior Researcher", to be responsible for the details of research work under the general supervision of the Chief/SRS extremely useful for more efficient work of this unit.

DOCUMENT NO. 11  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. L  
DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE:  
AUTH: HR 70-2  
DATE: 12 MAY 82 REVIEWER: 103430

13 April 1956

Chief, SRS/DDI

SUBJECT: Initiation of Projects

1. I do not mean to suggest a bureaucratic method of procedure when engaging in a project but I do think, in the interest of economy of efforts, of confronting of intra-office views and of possible sharpening up casually offered ideas, we should roughly follow certain "rituals".

2. When a Staff member has an idea for a new project, or if an idea has been generated by the Staff as a whole, the first thing to be done is, I think, the presentation of Terms of Reference. They need not necessarily be as elaborate as those in ONE; a brief outline of the project and its purpose suffices.

3. Next step is the consideration of this plan by the Staff members and a discussion during which suggestions for revisions or objections to the project as a whole or in parts, if any, should be stated. The actual beginning of the work should not take place before the outline has been thus discussed, criticized, and possibly revised.

25X1A5a 4. Next step is to ascertain what, if anything, exists in the field of the project in the pertinent bureaus of the US Government or if such institutions as [REDACTED] have done research on it. I strongly urge that no new major project be undertaken before we have made certain that possible duplications are avoided. Moreover, discussions with knowledgeable analysts or operations people should be held, if possible and feasible. None of us, or, for that matter, of any office in CIA, knows all, and no intelligence paper should go out of SRS that has not considered the best available views in addition to our own.

5. Only then, I feel, should we actually start writing. In other words, since we don't need to coordinate a finished paper, we should do all in our power to assemble coordinated facts prior to its drafting.

25X1A9a

12  
DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
NO CHANGE IN CLASS. ☒  
☒ DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: HR 70-2  
DATE: 12 MAY 82 REVIEWER: 103430

15 February 1956

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

1. I have given some thought to the problem of how best to organize work in a staff as small as ours and how to divide our individual work days advantageously. I can not at this time come up with definite answers but I would like to focus our collective attention on some of the greatest difficulties.

2. We are confronted with the task of reading incoming material and commenting on some of it; working on individual projects and doing the leg work for our projects due to the lack of research assistants; maintaining relations with pertinent persons and offices, and advising and making recommendations to them; and discussing current problems and Staff issues among ourselves. We can not possibly do all these things at the same time. We have to make a choice what to do first and last, and what to eliminate.

3. Perusal of the intake is important but takes time. A system may have to be devised allocating parts of the intake to certain persons. We can not spend half a day or more reading the daily mail.

4. Whoever is engaged in a major project has little or no time to do anything else. So long as he must be his own research assistant, his actual thinking and creating activity is greatly shortened anyway. This would eliminate him, for all practical purposes, from doing any other work for the Staff and, in turn, impair the Staff's capabilities.

5. The only way out, as I see it, is a stringent condensation of the work and safeguards to prevent us from dissipating our strength. This could perhaps be done by carefully mapping out a schedule of sorts which would give us some guidance for the use of our time and the direction of our efforts yet leave us enough flexibility to maneuver. As time goes by and we are shaken down, we probably shall have developed enough experience to proceed in an economical way.

6. In this connection, it occurs to me that we might be in a delicate position vis-a-vis management and all other investigating officials who want to know what we have produced. Our production, in many respects, is bound to be unaccountable - on paper. We are not primarily a paper-producing outfit; we also produce by recommending and stimulating. This can not easily be documented except in terse notes in the daily log, which thus becomes very important evidence of our activities.

13  
DOCUMENT NO. \_\_\_\_\_  
RE ORANGE IN CLASS. ☒  
IT DECLASSIFIED  
CLASS. CHANGED TO: TS S C  
NEXT REVIEW DATE: \_\_\_\_\_  
AUTH: HR 70-2

25X1A9a